1

DEPOSITION OF CRAIG DOBSON

Taken on behalf of the Plaintiffs

December 9, 2021

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the deposition of CRAIG DOBSON via Zoom was taken before Julie Purcell, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, on Thursday, December 9, 2021, commencing at the hour of 1:00 p.m.

```
2
1
   APPEARANCES:
   Levi Merrithew Horst, PC
   By Jesse A. Merrithew
    610 SW Alder Street, Suite 415
 3
   Portland, OR 97205
    (971) 229-1241
 4
    jesse@lmhlegal.com
 5
    Oregon Justice Resource Center
6
   By Franz H. Bruggemeier
       Juan C. Chavez
 7
   PO Box 5248
   Portland, OR 97208
   (503) 944-2270
 8
    fbruggemeier@ojrc.info
 9
   jchavez@ojrc.info
   Albies & Stark, LLC
10
   By J. Ashlee Albies
    1 SW Columbia Street, Suite 1850
11
   Portland, OR 97204
   (503) 308-4770
12
   ashlee@albiesstark.com
13
              Counsel for Plaintiffs
14
15
   J. SCOTT MOEDE
   Chief Deputy City Attorney
    scott.moede@portlandoregon.gov
16
   NAOMI SHEFFIELD
17
   Senior Deputy City Attorney
   naomi.sheffield@portlandoregon.gov
   ROBERT YAMACHIKA
18
    Senior Deputy City Attorney
19
   rob.yamachika@portlandoregon.gov
   MICHAEL PORTER
20
   mike.porter@portlandoregon.gov
   Portland City Attorney's Office
    1221 SW 4th Avenue, Rm. 430
21
   Portland, OR 97204
2.2
              Counsel for Defendant
23
24
   Also Present:
                    Teressa Raiford, Clair Warnock
25
```

 ${\tt DON'T}$ SHOOT PORTLAND, et al. v. CITY OF PORTLAND CRAIG DOBSON

3:20-cv-00917-HZ 12/9/2021

		3
1	EXAMINATION INDEX	
2	Page	
3	Examination by Mr. Merrithew 4-83	
4		
5	EXHIBIT INDEX	
6	- none marked -	
7		
8		
9		
LO		
L1		
L2		
L3		
L 4		
L5		
L6		
L 7		
L8		
L9		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

3:20-cv-00917-HZ 12/9/2021

4 1 CRAIG DOBSON 2 having been first duly sworn under oath, testified under 3 oath as follows: 4 5 EXAMINATION BY MR. MERRITHEW: 6 7 Is it Lieutenant Dobson? Ο. 8 Α. It's Commander Dobson. 9 Commander Dobson. Commander, have you ever Ο. 10 had your deposition taken before? 11 I've had a couple, yes, sir. Α. 12 0. Okav. So you understand that this is a 13 proceeding that is under oath subject to the penalty of perjury? 14 15 Α. Yes, yes. And the primary difference in terms of how 16 Ο. 17 it's recorded as opposed to state court is we have a 18 court reporter who is listening to this and trying to 19 take it down. Do you understand that? 20 Α. Yes. 21 The Zoom depositions I've found are difficult O. 22 for many reasons, but one of them is that it's harder 23 not to talk over one another and that's pretty important 24 for the court reporter. So, if you can agree to do your 25 best to wait until I finish asking a question, I'll do

- 1 my best to wait until you've finished answering the
 2 question, and we'll try not to annoy the court reporter.
 3 Is that a good plan?
 - A. I hope to follow that plan, yes.
 - Q. Okay. Commander Dobson, the other thing that makes this particular deposition a little bit unusual is I'm not actually here to learn about Commander Dobson's recollections or understanding of anything. You're here to speak on behalf of the City of Portland. Do you understand that?
- 11 A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And the City has designated you -- on my cheat sheet -- to talk about three different topics that we asked for a witness to talk about. Do you understand that?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Do you believe that you're as prepared as you can be to speak for the City of Portland on those three topics?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. I'd like for you to begin by telling us -- actually, strike that.
 - I'm going to start with the topic that I think is a little bit more discrete, which is topic No. 9, regarding the policies, directives and trainings that

```
51
    information with our intelligence unit and providing me
 1
 2
    that which I needed.
 3
                   MR. MERRITHEW: Can we take like a 10 or
 4
    15-minute break?
 5
                   MR. YAMACHIKA:
                                   Yeah.
                                   Thanks.
 6
                   MR. MERRITHEW:
 7
                             2:23 to 2:39 p.m.)
                   (Recess:
 8
 9
    BY MR. MERRITHEW: (Continuing)
10
              All right. Commander Dobson, I'd like to move
         0.
11
   on to talking about riot control agents with you.
12
         A.
              Okay.
13
              How does the bureau define riot control
         0.
14
            What's in that category of munitions?
    agents?
15
         A.
             That would be CS, CN, which we don't use, OC,
16
   under the pyro -- it would be pyro, there's different
17
    types, are typically the three that we look at.
18
         0.
              Okay. And by "pyro," you mean ammunition that
19
   has a pyrotechnic ignition system?
20
         A.
             It burns.
2.1
         O.
              The handheld OC spray canisters that officers
22
    carry, those are not included in that category of
23
   weapons --
24
             Not usually. We do not consider -- no, that
25
   is correct.
```

52 MR. YAMACHIKA: Just to make sure we're 1 2 not missing something, like OC vapor, is that different? 3 THE WITNESS: So that would be a crowd 4 control munition typically, but it's limited in its 5 effects. 6 7 BY MR. MERRITHEW: (Continuing) 8 With respect to riot control agents, does Q. 9 Incident Command need to give a specific direction 10 before members on the ground are authorized to use riot 11 control agents on a crowd? 12 **A**. Yes. Typically, yes. 13 So, is it then the case that it is in fact the 0. 14 Incident Commander who is deciding when or whether to 15 use riot control agents? 16 **A**. Yes. 17 Ο. So, can you tell me what factors the Incident 18 Commander takes into account when deciding whether or 19 not to use riot control agents in response to a 20 gathering of people? 2.1 Α. So, again, we're looking at a variety of 22 In particular for CS, if we're using CS gas or things. 23 OC gas, we're looking at a number of factors. We're 24 looking at location. We're looking at weather. 25 looking at the topography that's there. We're looking,

weather gets hot enough and things get dry enough, because we're using a burning device, we would limit it based on its chance of setting something on fire.

Q. All right. Let's talk more about the aspects of the crowd that would cause Incident Command to either authorize or not authorize the use of tear gas, CS gas or other types of gas. You said something about whether you have a civil disturbance or an unlawful assembly and how many people in the crowd are engaged in criminal activity.

Could you tell us, is there any particular threshold that Incident Command is looking for before authorizing the use of CS gas against the crowd, like, you know, 60 percent of the crowd has to be engaged in criminal activity or 20 percent or anything like that?

A. It's really hard to make that kind of determination. Again, you're looking at situational awareness of what do you have, understanding your tools. So, CS gas is effective in moving a crowd. It causes very little damage in -- So, we're looking at -- When we're looking at what tools to use, we're looking at what is going to be safe and effective both for the crowd, for the public, as well as the police. And so can I use this tool on a crowd that is largely either in riot or in unlawful assembly and does it -- is it a tool

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

56 that gives me the stand-off distance so that it's safer for me to apply this tool as opposed to having to use batons with a crowd. All of those factors come in when we're making that decision with a crowd. You know, are they throwing projectiles so it's not safe for us to get into that crowd. (It's those type of things.) From Incident Command's point of view, any 0. time the CS gas is used on a crowd, would you acknowledge (that) there will be people who will be affected by the gas who have committed no criminal act? Α. So, we recognize that gas, once -- once deployed, is indiscriminate in that we can't -- we don't control where it goes. What we do because we understand the gravity of using CS gas, we try not to use it unless we feel that it's actually going to be a help. then, also, prior to using it, we give enough warnings so that those that are there that -- our hope is those that are there that recognize that there's something going on here, that the police are now going to deploy it on, will now choose to leave, and then give them directions in which way to go. 0. Under PPB directives, a person who is in a crowd who has been directed to leave by a sound truck or other means, who just stands there and doesn't leave,

that person is engaged in passive resistance; is that

```
57
   right?
 1
2
                   MR. YAMACHIKA: Object to form.
3
              Go ahead.
4
         A.
              Yes.
5
         O.
              So, whenever CS gas is used on a crowd, people
6
   who are engaged in only passive resistance are affected
7
   by the gas; is that right?
8
                   MR. YAMACHIKA: Same objection.
9
              Go ahead.
10
              So, persons that would be in there that have
11
    chosen not to leave, yes.
12
         O.
              So, what I'm trying to understand is, is there
13
    any threshold where, from Incident Command's point of
14
    view, we have to have greater than, say, five, ten,
15
    twenty percent of the crowd engaged in something more
16
    than passive resistance before we're going to use CS gas
17
    on this crowd?
                   MR. YAMACHIKA: Objection. Asked and
18
19
    answered.
20
              Go ahead.
              So, when -- when we look at using CS gas,
21
         Α.
22
    we're looking at a situation where we feel that the use
23
    of it is going to help us eliminate whatever life safety
24
    concerns that we have that we're seeing there.
25
    typically we only use it when we have a life safety
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

62

behavior of the crowd. If we suddenly see that the crowd has changed conditions, we would then cease that order on the ground. As they encounter things or situations, they could make the indepen -- once we've given authorization, they could make that independent decision. As that push is going on, if they find that they need to use additional amounts of gas to continue the group from moving, they -- they could do that. again, we're monitoring. We're getting feedback from the ground of what's going on and what the situation is so that we can, again, constantly looking at -- at what point is it time for us to try to de-escalate this and change tactics to -- to bring us -- again, de-escalate and bring us back to normalcy. Okay. Do I understand from that answer that 0. once (it's authorized, (it continues to be authorized) until Incident Command says, "No more"? **A**. I -- It's a little dry -- cut and dry there. We would -- So, for example, if we are asking them to -our officers to do a push or dispersal, we would typically give them an area to disperse from and they would be authorized to use it within that area as they needed based on the conditions that they saw. Once the group either got outside of that area or we saw a change in the conditions, we might change or bring that order

12/9/2021

63

back to not allowing it.

- Q. Okay. So, the Incident Command is, in that
- 3 example, deciding that you're going to use the gas to
- 4 try and clear these three blocks, if that's what the
- 5 authorization is, then the guys on the ground would not
- 6 have authority to use gas outside of that area; is that
- 7 right?

1

- 8 A. Again, you've got exigent circumstances.
- 9 You've got that clause in there. So, if there was
- something like that that popped up, they would be able
- 11 to explain that. But, yes, in general, they would do it
- 12 for what they needed to.
- Part of our training is understanding our
- 14 tools and understanding the gravity of each of our
- 15 tools. Each of them understands that when we use CS
- 16 | gas, we have to be very careful about how we use it and
- 17 | it's not something that we would use -- We give them the
- 18 | decision, but they understand the consequences of using
- 19 it.
- 20 Q. Okay. So, when Incident Command is making a
- 21 decision whether or not to authorize the use of CS gas,
- 22 | what directives from the bureau are implicated in that
- 23 | decision?
- 24 A. 635 and 1010.
- Q. Okay. What parts of 1010 are implicated in

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I, Julie Purcell, Professional Reporter and Oregon
4	Notary, hereby certify that said witness personally
5	appeared before me via Zoom at the time and place set
6	forth in the caption hereof; that at said time and place
7	I reported in stenotype all testimony adduced and other
8	oral proceedings had in the foregoing matter; that
9	thereafter my notes were transcribed through
10	computer-aided transcription, under my direction, and
11	that foregoing pages constitute a full, true and
12	accurate record of all such testimony adduced and oral
13	proceedings had, and of the whole thereof.
14	I further certify review of the transcript was
15	requested.
16	Witness my hand this 13th day of December, 2021.
17	
18	Julie Hurcell
19	Julie Purcell, CSR
20	Certified Shorthand Reporter
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	